

THE EFFECT OF THINK PAIR SHARE TECHNIQUE ON THE ENGLISH READING ACHIEVEMENT OF THE STUDENTS DIFFERING IN ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AT GRADE EIGHT OF SMPN 13 MATARAM

M.afan, A. A. I. N. Marhaeni, N. Dantes

Program Study Pendidikan Bahasa, Program Pascasarjana,
Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
Singaraja, Indonesia

email.m.afan.@pasca.undiksha.ac.id,
agung.marhaeni.@pasca.undiksha.ac.id,
nyoman.dantes.@pasca.undiksha.ac.id.

Abstract

This experimental research aimed at finding out the effect of Think-Pair-Share technique on the English reading achievement of the Students differing in achievement motivation at grade eight of SMPN 13 Mataram. This research with posttest only control group design by using 2x2 factorial design. The instrument used in this research are, English reading achievement test and achievement motivation questionnaire. 80 students were taken from six regular classes as the research sample with cluster random sampling technique. then divided them into experimental group and control group. The obtained data were analyzed by administering quantitative descriptive analysis with two ways analysis of variant (ANOVA). From the result of analysis it can be concluded that; 1). There was a significant difference in English reading achievement between the groups of student who were taught by using think-pair-share technique and those taught with conventional teaching technique. 2). There was an interaction effect between the teaching technique and achievement motivation toward the English reading achievement of the students. 3). There was a significant difference in English reading achievement between the group of students who had high achievement motivation taught with think-pair share cooperative technique and those who were taught with conventional teaching technique. 4) There was no significant difference in English reading achievement between the group of students who had low achievement motivation taught with think-pair share cooperative technique and those who were taught with conventional teaching technique.

Keywords: Think-Pair-Share Teaching Technique, English Reading Achievement, Achievement Motivation.

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, English is taught as a foreign language starting from elementary school till university. It is only focused on the mastery of its four language skills; they are speaking, writing, reading and listening. These four English language skills are taught in integrated way, since one of its skills can not be practiced without the others. Reading is one of the

four basic skills of English language that should be mastered by the learners besides among all of the major skills. Judith (1997) says that reading activity is a process of learner interacted with printed

Based on competency of reading is the ability to comprehend the written texts in English. In School Based Curriculum (KTSP), the students are expected to have to achieve the basic competency of

reading achievement as follows; 1.) The ability to obtain general and specific information in the written texts, 2.) The ability to obtain the main ideas of the written texts. 3.) The ability to guess the meaning of words, phrases, or sentences, based on the context, and 4.) The ability to guess the meaning of reference (Depdiknas, 2006).

In line with above problem in teaching for achieving the students in English reading comprehension, it was also found out that in SMPN 13 Mataram with the curriculum used which is known School Based Curriculum (*KTSP*). However, in fact, the teaching of reading has been developed in a longer period of teaching and learning time. But the students are still encountered by the great difficulties in comprehending the four competency of reading as stated in *KTSP* above. The role of the teacher as the facilitator in teaching learning process is too important to investigate out what factors that make the students are failure in comprehending a written text. It is in line with Nuthal (1982) who said that reading is a process in the readers confirm, reject, or refine the information presented in the written text as reading progress. This activity deals with the meaningful interpretation of the written text. If the learners are lacking of cognitive ability, background knowledge, and reading strategies, they will find difficulties in comprehending reading text.

In relation with the learning of English as a compulsory subject at the school that there are two factors which play an important role in influencing the achievement of the students in learning the English reading lesson, they are; internal factor and external factor. The internal factor was achievement motivation while the one of the external factors is teaching strategies. They are related one and another in teaching learning process.

Motivation can be defined as a concept used to describe the factors within an individual that arouse, maintain and channel behavior towards a goal. Motivation is often used to describe certain sorts of behavior. (<http://opax.swim.edu.au>). If there is a

motivation it is always there is a goal or target.

According to Geen in Wikipedia accessed on 10th of August 2012 at 8:03pm, from psychology's view. motivation refers to the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior. Motivation is a temporal and dynamic state that should not be confused with personality or emotion. Motivation is having the desire and willingness to do something.

Motivation defined as the desire to achieve the goal, combine with energy to work to reach the goal. In line with Djamarah (2002: 157) stated that motivation is psychology factor that can influence not only the learning process but also the result of learning. High motivation students will do more learning activity. Though, it is suggested that the teacher must improve students' motivation in learning.

Murray (1978) cited by Wagner (2005: 42) said that human have several motives in their lives, achievement motivation is one of them. Moreover, Atkinzon (1996) in Wagner (2005: 143) defines that achievement motivation is the orientation that result from two separate motives they are not only to achieve success but also to avoid failure. The motive to achieve success supported by three kinds: (a) the need to success or need achievement; (b) the person estimate of the likelihood of success in performing the particular task; and the last is (c) the incentive for success, that is, how much the person wishes to succeed in that particular task. On the other hand the motive to avoid the failure is also supported by three similar things; (a) need to avoid failure which, like the need to achieve success, varies among peoples; (b) the person estimate of the likelihood of failure at the particular task; and the last things (c) the incentive value of failure at that task, that is, how unpleasant it would be to fail. The relative desire of the motives both to success and avoid failure determines the level of task difficulty people will prefer. When the motive is stronger, as it is for people who have a high need to achieve, in which the likelihood of success is reasonable and the pride in accomplishment fairly high. On the

contrary, when the motive to avoid failure is dominant, people either very simple task in which the possibility of failure is low or a very difficult task in which the equally in failing is low.

Broadly speaking that there are two factor that influence students' achievements in learning English language, they are; internal factor and external factor.

Internal factor. Internal factor means that the factor that is came from the reader himself/herself or usually known as personal factor, because thee factor has existed inside the reader. It is deal with self-motivation and interest (Slameto , 2010:190). (1) *Achievement Motivation*. Achievement motivation plays an important role in teaching learning process. Brown (2001:75) stated that achievement motivation is very urgently required in comprehending the text of the English language. The students will be motivated to read the passage when they fell that they need something from the text. If one has an interest to read, it means that he/she will get a good achievement. On the other side, if the reader has not any interest to read, it influences his/her achievement in doing the activities.

Based on the above points it can be concluded that, it is impossible for the students to understand the text if he/she has no interest and motivation to read the text. The high interest and high motivation result the excellent achievement of the students in learning the language.

External factor. The external factor that closed relationship to reading material and teacher of reading and teaching strategies, they are interrelated each other.

Material of Learning. The achievements of the students in learning the language depend upon the level of difficulty of its material. Thus, it can influence students' achievement, if the material given is not at the right level of difficulty for the reader or the students. In this case, teaching material plays an important role in arouse learner' motivation in learning. *The teacher*, the teacher should be careful in selecting the materials and giving the tasks to the students because they are related to the achievement of the students' in

comprehending the material of learning. *Strategy of Teaching*, Richard, et (2001:195) stated that one of the goal of language teaching by applying learning strategy one of them is cooperative teaching strategy.

Cooperative teaching strategy aims to enhance students' motivation and reduce students stress and to design a positive affective and classroom atmosphere. It is supported by Killen (1996:82) states that Cooperative learning encourages the students to verbalize their ideas and to compare them with ideas and feelings of other students. This strategy is also improves students self esteem, positive interpersonal relations with other students, motivation to gain good mark, and positive attitudes toward schools. It is proven by Slavin (2005:10) in his study that found out cooperative learning strategy also give a positive effect towards the achievement of slow students.

Cooperative learning as a teaching learning strategy has any beneficent as follows;

1). *Cooperative learning models the scientific experience.*

Students working in groups learn about the joys as well as the frustrations involved in scientific inquiry. Cooperative learning models is the real scientific experience in which scientists work together, not in isolation, to solve difficult problems. With cooperative learning, the classroom becomes a fertile environment for ideas and novel solutions.

2). *Cooperative learning empowers and involves students.*

Cooperative learning raises students' self-esteem because they are learning something on their own through cooperation, rather than being handed prepackaged knowledge. It helps students become self-sufficient, self-directed, lifelong learners. In a cooperative learning environment, students are less dependent on you for knowledge.

3). *Cooperative learning serves the heterogeneous classroom.*

With group work, everyone has the chance to participate as well as a role to play. As students join forces to achieve a common goal, they come to recognize commonalities that cut across differences

related to ethnicity, socioeconomic background, and gender. Likewise, cooperative learning provides an excellent vehicle for students of differing ability levels to work together in a positive way. Challenged students can interact successfully with average and advanced students and in so doing can learn that they too have something to offer. Cooperative learning strengthens interpersonal skills. It means that group tasks are structured so that students must cooperate to succeed. Students quickly understand that they will "sink or swim" together by how constructively they interact. Consequently, students develop important interpersonal and social skills that help them function in a group setting and that will ultimately benefit them socially, at work, and in other situations.

More over Sansone, carol.et al.(2000) stated that there are some ideas for motivate the students to improve their learning. They are; explanations, reward, care. Have students participate, teach inductively, students' needs, make learning visual, the use of positive emotion to enhance learning and motivation, and remember that energy sells.

Achievement motivation is a force that leads the humans to get an excellent standard for achieving goals. The students who have high achievement motivation tend to love competition situation, new things, and challenging task.

More over, individual achievement gives challenging task for the learner to appreciate and share all information in their groups or to other groups. High achievement motivation learner will attempted a power to achieve success. It can be predicted that the students with high achievement motivation will go further to increase their achievement motivation in English language learning achievement.

The students of low achievement motivation have several characteristics which are in contras to the students who having high achievement motivation. They do not have real goals in their learning. They do not like challenging task and new things, do not have high responsibilities toward the task that has been given.

The instructional applied in teaching technique really effect the students'

English language achievement. The teaching instruction has several activities to achieve the students takes a part in those activity. Every step in a particular cooperative strategy usually supported the students and stimulates their creativity to design up not only their own confidence but also their motivation to learn. Based on some previous empirical study, the activities in teaching technique of cooperative and Conventional supported the students in learning process that can achieve a better English language achievement. So, it is predicted that there will be an interaction effect between teaching technique and the students' achievement motivation in English language achievement.

One of Cooperative learning strategies is Think-Pair-Share, Lyman (1981) and his academic colleges in Maryland (cited in Dewi 2011) developed new cooperative learning strategy named Think-Pair-Share (TPS). Its name inspired by three stages of their students' action, with emphasizes on what students are to be doing on each of those stages. He argued that it is difficult to understand what the readers are reading. This condition can make the readers/students in absolutely frustration condition. To find out them a best solution in understanding what they are reading about/for, he proposed a new reading strategy named TPS (*Think-Pair-Share*). This is a smart academic teaching technique model for promoting critical thinking and articulate communication in the classroom. In short, Think-Pair-Share provides an opportunity for all students to share their thinking with a least one another students, which in turn, increase their sense of involvement in the classroom teaching learning process.

The benefits of this strategy are; First, Presenting "think time" improves the students' response quality. *Second*, students became actively participated in thinking about the academic concepts presented in lesson. *Third*, research reveals that we need time to mentally "chew over" new ideas in direction to keep them in memory. *Fourth*, when teachers served an over loaded capacity of information on students needed at once time, much of them are lost. *Fifth*, if the

teacher gives students time to “think-pair-share” throughout the lesson, more of the critical information will be kept in place. *Sixth*, the students talk over new ideas, they are supported to make sense of those new ideas refer to their basic knowledge. During this time discussion step resolve the problem on their misunderstanding of the topic discussion. *Seventh*, students are wishes to participate since they do not feel the peer pressure appeared in front of the whole class. *Eight*, Think-Pair-Share is easily to apply on the spur of the moment. The last benefit is that it is applicable easily for the big classes.

The second teaching strategy that is treated in this research is conventional teaching strategy. Conventional teaching strategy in English reading activity in this research is dealing with the teacher's way of teaching technique application in classroom. These activities of conventional teaching English language were commonly seen during the observation in the setting of this research, SMPN 13 Matarm. It is conducted based on the text book.

There are five characteristics of conventional teaching technique in English reading proposed by Scherman (1992) cited by Dewi (2011), they are; 1). To conduct this technique does not need much time, 2). Teacher-oriented class is applied, 3). The students were freely to do the task individually, 4). The teachers present the materials which are taken from the text book. 5). The prior teaching focus on the result, not the teaching process.

Based on the qualifications of conventional teaching technique, it can be concluded that this technique makes the students become unmotivated, because of it is less challenging them. On the other hand, It is not only makes the students boring easily but also uninteresting technique in the teaching learning process. More over, this technique tends to order the students to find out the answer of the questions of English reading text priority.

The academic references above supported the aims of this research entitled *The Effect of Think-Pair-Share Technique on the English Reading Achievement of the Students Differing in Achievement Motivation at Grade Eight of SMPN 13*

Mataram. To make clearness of the aim of this research are stated as follow;

- a. To discover whether or not there is significant difference in English reading achievement of the students who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share technique and those who are taught by using Conventional teaching technique?
- b. To discover whether not there is instructional effect between teaching techniques and students' achievement motivation in English reading achievement?
- c. To discover whether or not there is significant difference in English reading achievement between students with high achievement motivation who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share technique and those are taught by using conventional technique?
- d. To discover whether or not there is significant difference in English reading achievement between students with low achievement motivation who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share technique and those are taught by using conventional technique?

METHODS

This research is done in grade eight at SMPN 13 Mataram in school year 2012/2013. There were 8 classes of them, two classes (VIII.A and VIIB) were not selected on the reason that they were designed exclusively as the top classes. The population of this research are 240 students of six regular classes. The research sample were 80 students which were taken by using cluster random sampling technique which finally produce 4 classes sample in which 2 clasees as experimental and the rest of them is control group.. In deciding the sample in this research, was applied. In this technique, the researcher selected in which groups, not individuals within cluster (Gall, at all, 2003:174).

This experimental research is designed with the post-test only, control group design. This procedure done since it is not possible to change the existed

present classes to be new classes as a research sample. This research did not use pre-test but experiment posttest-only control group design. The experimental group was treated with Think-Pair-Share technique, while the control group treated with conventional teaching technique.

Based on the variables researched in this study, the research design was 2x2 factorial design with two ways analysis of variants (ANOVA.AB) (Dantes:2011). It is used to analyze the two classifications for one dependents variable, one independent variable and one variable of moderator. The first variable of moderator was achievement motivation and English reading achievement was dependent variable while independent variable was teaching technique (Think-Pair-Share technique and Conventional teaching technique).

There were two forms of data gathering technique. Achievement motivation questionnaire and English reading achievement test. The achievement motivation was not a non-test about a report of personal-self. It was the abject of the students' achievement motivation in learning English. The statements were in the form of positive and negative statements. This instrument was constructed based on the blue print used 50 items of 5-scala Liker. The score of each items is 1-5.(5 = strongly agree, 4=agree, 3 = undecided, 2 = disagree and 1 = strongly disagree. The total score of achievement questionnaire test were from 50-250, These achievement motivation questionnaire containing five dimensions are;1).Achieving goal, 2).Anticipating failure,3).Having opportunity,4). Having responsibility on assignment and 5). Having opinion toward English native speaker.

The achievement motivation questionnaire was administered into these classes. Than the result of questionnaire answer sheets was found out in which of scale-test that differentiate the students who had high achievement motivation and the students who had low achievement motivation. result of test, 80 students were chosen for the experimental group treated with think-pair-share technique, and the control group treated with conventional

technique. The 25% of the students who gained the lower score were categorized as the students with low achievement motivation. On the others side, 25% of the students who gained a highest score were categorized into the students of high achievement motivation.

And the English reading test used in this research was multiple choice test formula that was covering four sub-skills in reading such are; (a). the ability to obtained not only general but also the specific information that are from the reading passage, (b). The ability to obtain the main ideas of reading passage, (c) the ability to guest the meaning of words, phrases, or sentences, based on the reading passage, (d). the ability to guess the meaning of reference (Depdiknas, 2006:12). The maximum score was 1 for the correct answer and 0 for the wrong answer. This test was tested after the treatment given.

The data were analyzed with two forms of statistics analysis, they were description of data analysis and prerequisite test for hypothesis testing.

before analyzing data, the data was tested in order to find out whether it had normal distribution and homogeneity of variance or not.

The test of homogenety was done to investigate whether the variance were homogenous or not. In this research *Barlett test* was conducted in order to know the homogeity of variance data.

After conducting the normality and homogeneity test, than the data could be further 'analyzed by using two-ways ANOVA. If the two-ways ANOVA find that significance interactional effect were between strategy of teaching reading and achievement motivation in improving tudents' English reading achievement, than the post test-hoch test could be done, in this *t-Scheffe test* test.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing in this research was administrated with statistically by two-way ANOVA. If there was interaction, the hypothesis testing was followed by *t-*

Scheffe test to find out the interaction effect.

The following point out the result of hypothesis testing by two-way ANOVA on the students' English reading achievement that refers to reading competency in this research.

There are some criterions to test the research hypothesis as follows;

1. If the value of Fob was higher than the value of Fcv ($F_{ob} > F_{cv}$) in English reading achievement between the factors of teaching technique, it mean that there was a significant difference in English reading achievement on students who were treated with TPS cooperative technique and who were not treated with its (conventional technique)
2. If the value of Fob was higher than the value of Fcv ($F_{ob} > F_{cv}$) in English reading achievement data between the achievement motivation

factors, it mean that there was a significant difference in English reading achievement of high achievement motivation students and low achievement motivation students.

3. If the value of interaction effect Fob was higher than the value of Fcv ($F_{ob} > F_{cv}$) for the English reading achievement data, it mean there was an interaction effect between the teaching technique and the students' achievement motivation on the students' English reading achievement.

Because of there was an interaction between the teaching technique and the students' achievement motivation on students' English reading achievement, the *t-Scheffe* test then was administrated.

The result of hypothesis testing by using two-way ANOVA at the 5 % significance level as shown on the following table.

Source of Variance	SS	Df	MS	Fob	Fcv	Remarks
A (Teaching technique)	6.613	1	6.613	5.140	0.026	significant
B (Achievement Motivation)	16.200	1	16.200	12.592	0.001	significant
AB (interaction of two variables)	9.800		9.800	7.617	0.007	significant
E	97.775	76	1.287			
Total	103.338	79				

From the table above it can be concluded that the result of analysis was used to test hypothesis which had been formulated as follows;

1. It was found out that the difference test of the students achievement based on the treatment given. If F value is higher than 0.05 ($P > 0.05$), H_0 is received or the mean score of all population are similar. If F values is lower than 0.05 ($P < 0.05$), H_0 is rejected or the mean score of all population are different. From the data output above, it shown that Fob was 5.140 and Fcv was 0.026 It meant that the mean score of all population were different significantly. It meant that there was significant difference between the achievement of group of students who treated with

Think-Pair-Share technique and group of the students who treated with conventional teaching technique. It was clearly seen from the finding which shown that the mean score of two groups students' English reading achievement who treated with Think-Pair-Share technique was 13.45 on the other side the mean score of the students' English reading achievement that treated with conventional teaching technique was 12. 87 Therefore, there was a significant difference on the application of Think-Pair-Share technique and conventional teaching technique on the students' English reading achievement.

2. Difference test of the students' achievement based on the level of

achievement motivation. If F value is higher than 0.05 ($P > 0.05$) H_0 is received of the mean score of all population are the same. If F value was lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), H_0 is rejected or the mean score of all populations are different. The data output above shown that Fob, was 12.592 and Fcv was 0.001 It means that the mean score of all population were different significantly. It means that there were any significant differences of the students' high achievement motivation and the students' low achievement motivation.

3. Interaction between Teaching technique (A) and achievement motivation level. If Fob, is higher than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), it means that H_0 is receive but if Fcv is lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) it means that is rejected. Based on the above data output, it shown that Fob, was 7.617 and Fcv was 0.001 It means that there was interaction effect between Teaching technique (A) and achievement motivation (B) level which effect on the students' English reading achievement.

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis Testing. 1.

The result of hypothesis testing 1 shown that there was a significance difference in English reading achievement of the students who were taught with TPS cooperative technique and the English reading achievement for those who were taught with Conventional teaching technique. It can be seen on the result finding that Fob was 6.613. on the other side that Fcv was 0.026 When Fob was higher than Fcv the alternative hypothesis was rejected. From the main score of two groups (A) as the experimental group that treated with Think-Pair-Share technique and (B) as the control group that is treated with conventional teaching technique which were effected on students' English reading achievement. It can be seen on the mean score of experimental group (A1) was 77.52, and the mean score of control group was 75.05 The comparison of score between bout of them as shown on the following table;

Scores	TPS technique (A)	Conventional technique (B)
Minimum score	64.30	66.70
Maximum score	90.50	83.30
Mean	77.52	75.05
Mode	69.00	76.00

The table above shown, that the students' English reading achievement who were treated with Think-Pair-Share technique was higher than that those who were treated with conventional teaching technique.

This result finding supported to the previous studies on the effective of using cooperative teaching technique in English skill achievement. Seetape (2003) studied the effects of cooperative learning on English reading achievement and students' behaviors towards this learning method used in the English classroom. The result shown that the pos-test scores after learning English reading using cooperative

learning were higher than the pretest scores at the .05 level of significance. Most of the samples showed very good behavior in cooperating in their tasks. Their cooperative behavior had increasingly been developed. Some elements of poor behavior had decreased by up to 14.29 percent.

Hypothesis testing 2

The result of hypothesis testing 2 shown that there was an interaction between the teaching techniques {(A) Think-Pair-Share technique and the Conventional teaching technique} and the students' achievement motivation {(B1)

high achievement motivation and (B2) low achievement motivation}. It can be seen on the result finding that Fob was 7.617 on the other side that Fcv was 0.007. When Fob was higher than Fcv the alternative hypothesis was accepted. By this score it can be concluded that there was an interaction between the application of teaching technique {(A) Think-Pair-Share technique and the Conventional teaching technique} and achievement motivation (B)

Hypothesis testing 3

The result of hypothesis testing 3 shown that there was a significant difference on English reading Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and those were taught by using conventional teaching technique was accepted. From the descriptive statistic analysis shown that the mean score of English reading achievement of the high achievement motivation students who taught by Think-Pair-Share teaching technique was 84.73,

meanwhile the mean score of English reading achievement of the high achievement motivation students who were taught by conventional teaching technique was 77.02. Based on the result of t-test, it was discovered that **t-Scheffe** test score was 70.84 which was higher that **t-table** 2.093 with two tail test 0.05. It means that H0 was rejected and H1 was received. So, there was a significant difference between the English reading achievement of the high achievement motivation students who treated with Think-Pair-Share technique and those were taught by using conventional teaching technique. The comparison of mean score between the high achievement motivation students who were taught by using Think-Pair-Share technique and the high achievement motivation students who were taught by using conventional teaching technique as shown as the following table;

Scores	A1B1	A2B1
Minimum score	78.00	71.40
Maximum score	90.50	83.30
Mean	84.73	77.02
Mode	83.30	76.20

From the table above, it was clearly seen that the English reading achievement of the high achievement motivation students who were treated with TPS cooperative teaching technique was higher than those who were treated with Conventional teaching technique.

Hypothesis Testing 4.

The result of hypothesis testing 4 shown that there was a significant difference on English reading achievement of Low achievement motivation students who were taught by using Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and those were taught by using conventional teaching technique was accepted. From the descriptive statistic analysis shown that the mean score of English reading achievement of the Low achievement motivation students who taught by Think-Pair-Share was 73.10 while the mean score of English reading

achievement of the Low achievement motivation students who were taught by conventional teaching technique was 70.06 . Based on the result of t-test, it was discovered that **t-Scheffe** score was 40.208 which was higher that **t-table** 2.093 with two tail test 0.05. It means that H0 was rejected and H1 was received. So, there was a significant difference between the English reading achievement of the low achievement motivation students who treated with Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and those were taught by using conventional teaching technique. The comparison of mean score between the low achievement motivation students who were taught by using Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and the low achievement motivation students who were taught by using conventional teaching technique as shown as the following table;

Score	A1B2	A2B2
Minimum score	64.00	67.00
Maximum score	76.00	79.00
Mean	70.06	73.02
Mode	69.00	71.40

From the table above, it was clearly seen that the English reading achievement of the low achievement motivation students who were treated with Conventional teaching technique was too higher than those who were treated with Think-Pair-Share teaching technique.

Based on the result finding as shown on the above table, it seems a paradox thing for the language teaching technique. Since, the aims of the teaching techniques used in this particular research were to solve the students' problems in comprehend the reading passage as well as to achieve the students' English reading achievement test. On the contrary, the teaching techniques used in this research, Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and conventional teaching technique would not be able to achieve the students' English reading achievement score test for the students whose low achievement in motivation learning.

In relation with the with low score result of the English reading achievement for the low achievement motivation students, Marhaeni (2005) stated that low achievement motivation students were prefer a statistic condition in which they felt secure and enjoyable, because they were not to get a new things and tended to considered that those things indicated their weaknesses. It is in line with these problems of achievement in English reading, McClelland (2010) in Lori L. Moore, Dustin K. Grabsch (2010) stated that the students who need a high achievement will generally have a better score than equally smart student whose weaker achievement needs. The students with high achievement motivation tended to get more developmental as well as getting a quickly promotion. Because of they are always trying to think a suitable way of completing some thing. On the contrary, for the students who have low achievement motivation are more concerned on environment. They just want to see how

other people feel about themselves not on how they well they are doing or completing some things well.

Based on the two statements above, it was found out in this research that students whose low achievement motivation tended to do some thing with a less efforts and exercises for making their achievement better. They just do and submitted their works without paid attention on the final result.

It was also found out that the students' long term memory in learning English was another aspect that should be considered as the aspect that contributed the result of low English reading achievement. The eight grade students of SMPN 13 Mataram in school year 2012/2013 have two hours English subject meeting for a week. This factor may effect on the students' memorization. They forgot the new vocabularies which have ever been introduced easily.

Conclusion

Based on the research findings and explained in the previous chapter, it was concluded that;

1. There was a significance difference in English reading achievement between students who are taught by Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and those who are taught by using conventional technique
2. There was an interaction effect between the teaching technique and (Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and students' achievement motivation in the students' English reading achievement
3. There was a significant difference in English reading achievement between students with high achievement motivation who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and those are taught by using conventional technique.

4. There was no significant difference in English reading achievement between students with low achievement motivation who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and those are taught by using conventional technique.

Implication

It has been described before that the analysis findings indicated that the students' English reading achievement were affected by the application of Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and achievement motivation. And more over, the students' English reading achievement that taught by using TPS cooperative technique was better quality than those who were taught by using Conventional teaching technique.

By knowing the result of analysis that implementation of Think-Pair-Share teaching technique effected on the students' English reading achievement differently, particularly for the students who had high achievement motivation level. It is strongly implied the teacher teaching staff must be considered the implication.

Suggestion

Based on the research findings of data analysis of the research and the implication which has been presented previously, it is strongly recommended that;

1. Teacher should be implementing the cooperative teaching technique of Think-Pair-Share teaching technique in teaching reading class, particularly, for high achievement motivation students. Think-Pair-Share teaching technique can also be used for low achievement motivation students as a way out to improve those students' motivation in English reading comprehension. But, the teacher should control and manage the class well to avoid the dominance of high achievement motivation students in the classroom.
2. Since the achievement motivation play an important role in giving a significant contribution on the students' reading achievement, the

English teacher are wished to be aware of the level of achievement motivation of their students, because it will influence the choice in using teaching techniques in the classroom.

3. The students should be aware on their own achievement motivation. When they do it, they must support and maximized the strength and minimized the weakness to reach a good achievement in learning the language.
4. For the next researcher, it is recommended to conduct a research on some variables that tended to the result of the study used Think-Pair-Share teaching technique and the students achievement motivation as moderator variable. The research can be conducted in a different setting, time, subjects, and materials in the purposed to obtain a more comprehensive study.
5. And the last, it is also recommended for the teacher to care of or dig up the students' achievement motivation in learning particularly in selecting teaching techniques and designing lesson activities. So, the goal of learning English can be achieved.

REFERENCES

- A Definition of Motivation. Cited in <http://opax.swin.edu.au/-388226/howto/it2/motiv1.htm>. Accessed on 20-8-2012; 8:17pm
- Aumpayap, 1982. The effect of Cooperative Learning on English Skills and Attitudes of the First-Year Students at Bangkok University, <http://www.ci.txstate.edu/Course/RD/G13Nicholson/CooperativeLearningStrategies.html>. Accessed on 15/10/2012, 21.00.PM
- Brown, H. 1980. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Dantes, Nyoman. Prof. Dr. 2011. Metodologi Penelitian; Seri Analisis Varians dan validasi Instrumen. UNDIKSHA. Program Pascasarjana

- Dewi, Moni juliani.2011. The effect of cooperative reading strategies on students reading comprehension: An experimental study on the parallel Eight grade students of SMP Negeri 3 Negara. *UNDIKSHA*. Unpublished Thesis.
- Depdiknas.2006. *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Mata Pelajaran Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*.jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional
- Djamarah,S.2002. *Prestasi Belajar dan Kompetensi Guru*. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional
- Gall, M.D. Gall, J.P.,& Borg, W.R. 2003. *Education Research: an Introduction*. 7th Edition, Boston : Allyn & Bacon
- Judith, A.S. 1997. *Reading Strategies for Young Children*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.Inc
- Lodico, Margueriten G.et al 2010. *Methods in Educational Research From Theory to Practice*. second edition. USA: Jossey-Bass
- Killen, Roy. 1996. *Effective Teaching Strategies*. Wentworth : Australia Print Group
- Marhaeni. Anak Agung Istri. Prof.Dr.M.A.,.2005. Pengaruh Asesmen Portofolio dan Motivasi Berprestasi Dalam Belajar Bahasa Inggris Terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Dalam Bahasa Inggris: Studi Experimen pada Mahasiswa Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP Singaraja.2004. UNJ. Unpublished Desertasi Doktor.
- Nuthal. 1982. Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language. http://www.alessays.com/sample_writing/pdf/onteaching.pdf/ Accessed on 17/32013,21.00.PM
- Richards, J.C. and Theodore.S.R. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. London : Cambridge University Press.
- Sansone, carol.et al.2000. *Intrinsic and Extrinsic motivation. The search for Optimal Motivation and Performance*. USA. Academic Press.
- Slavin Robert E. 2005. *Cooperative Learning: Theori, Riset, dan Praktik*. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Slameto, Drs.2010.*Belajar dan Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi*, Edisi revisi, cetakan ke 5,Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Wagner, Kendra.2005. Murray's Theory of Psychogenic Needs. [http://Psychology about.com/od/theory of personality/psychogenic/htm](http://Psychology.about.com/od/theory_of_personality/psychogenic/htm) Cited on, 18th March 2013.
- Wikipedia. Motivation. Cited in <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/motivation> . Accessed on 20-8-2012; 8:0.